

Application No. 10/660,706  
Reply dated April 5, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated December 8, 2004

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2 and the addition of Fig. 7. Figure 2 has been amended to correct an obvious error, and Figure 7 has been added to illustrate the operation of the embodiment shown in Figure 6.

Attachments:      Replacement Sheet  
                        New Sheet

Application No. 10/660,706  
Reply dated April 5, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated December 8, 2004

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Description of amendments**

The specification has been amended to correct a typographic error and to add the description of new Figure 7.

Figure 2 has been amended to correct an obvious error. In the description of Figure 2 (see paragraph [0030]), the length of the displacement bar (L) is described as equal to  $T + a$ . However, in the original Figure 2, the length of the displacement bar is shorter than  $T + a$ . Applicant has amended Figure 2 so that the length of the displacement bar (L) shown in Figure 2 is consistent with the description, i.e., equal to  $T + a$ .

Figure 7 has been added to illustrate the operation of the embodiment shown in Figure 6.

Claims 1-26 are now pending and under examination. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 15, and 26. No new matter has been added.

The amendments to claims 1, 8, 15, and 26 are supported by the application as originally filed (see, for example, Figures 2 and 3).

### **Interview summary**

Applicant's counsel greatly appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Saether during the course of an interview conducted on March 7, 2005.

In the interview, Examiner Saether and Applicant's counsel discussed possible claim amendments to overcome the cited references.

Application No. 10/660,706  
Reply dated April 5, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated December 8, 2004

Objection to the specification

The title of the specification was objected to as not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to make it more descriptive, thereby overcoming the objection.

Objection to the drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claimed invention. In the interview on March 7, 2005, Examiner Saether requested that a figure be added to illustrate the method of claim 26. In response, Applicant has added such a figure (Figure 7).

Objection to the claims

Claim 26 was objected to for containing informalities. Applicant has amended claim 26 to overcome the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kellstroem (U.S. Patent 5,779,419). Claims 15-20 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellstroem in view of Shappard (U.S. Patent 4,411,549). Claims 4-6, 11-13, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellstroem or the combination of Kellstroem and Shappard, in view of Reeves (U.S. Patent 5,660,417). For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As discussed in the interview, claims 1, 8, 15, and 26, as amended, overcome the cited references, because the cited references do not teach or suggest at least a displacement bar that extends across and outside the periphery of a nut body in a direction substantially parallel to the axis of the nut

Application No. 10/660,706

Reply dated April 5, 2005

Response to Office Action dated December 8, 2004

body. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103(a) have been overcome.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #011357.52664US).

Respectfully submitted,

April 5, 2005

  
Herbert I. Cantor  
Registration No. 24,392

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
HIC:SZ:tlm (368388)